



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

DISCUSSION

To the Editor of the School Review:

On my return from a year's exile abroad, I have for the first time seen Professor Stempel's review of the *Brief English Grammar* of which Miss Buck and myself are joint authors. Generally speaking, I do not believe in replying to a reviewer's criticisms; it is better to accept them in a contrite spirit and profit by them. Besides, the reviewer erred, if at all, on the side of leniency. I should make no comment in this instance were it not that one or two sentences in the review in question are so worded as to imply—or at least to permit the reader to infer—that the authors of the book were unfamiliar with recent researches in phonetics and historical grammar. Such implication or inference is, to speak modestly, not quite fair. At any rate, the authors would prefer to plead guilty on another count—that of not having said, in every instance, all that they knew. The fact is, that in the preparation of a brief and elementary textbook intended for all sorts of schools and all sorts of teachers, one cannot proceed as if one were writing a scientific monograph. One must often decide between a traditional, easily intelligible, not quite comprehensive statement or definition, on the one hand, and a strictly accurate but complicated and disconcerting statement, on the other. To speak of but one point, although I have read, I think, everything of importance that has been written on the English genitive, I should still be inclined to explain the apostrophe (especially if I were limited to ten words) as indicating the omission of the old English *z*. To reduce Jespersen's forty-eight pages on this subject to a single, clear, easily intelligible sentence, would perhaps not be impossible, but it would require one of those moments of inspiration which come unsought—if they come at all.

But, as I suggested at first, the authors have really no fault to find with the reviewer in his detailed criticisms, except that he was too sparing of them.

FRED NEWTON SCOTT

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN